

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services	OMB Clearance No: 0970-0492
CSBG Annual Report	Expiration Date: 01/31/2020
Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) Annual Report - State Administration Module	
<p>Note: The reporting timeframes for all information in the administrative module is based on the Federal Fiscal Year, which runs from October 1 of a given calendar year until September 30 of the following calendar year. When completing the annual report, respondents will first indicate the Federal Fiscal Year for which the state is submitting data. The Online Data Collection (OLDC) system will then auto-populate the administrative module with information from the appropriate year (year 1 or year 2) in the accepted CSBG State Plan. States will be able to update information in these sections, as necessary.</p>	
SECTION A CSBG LEAD Agency, CSBG Authorized Official, CSBG Point of Contact	
A1. Confirm and update the following information in relation to the lead agency designated to administer the CSBG in the State, as required by Section 676(a) of the CSBG Act.	
A1a. Lead Agency Alabama Department of Economic and Community Affairs	
A1.b. Cabinet or administrative department of this lead agency	
<input type="radio"/> Community Services Department	
<input type="radio"/> Human Services Department	
<input type="radio"/> Social Services Department	
<input type="radio"/> Governors Office	
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Community Affairs Department	
<input type="radio"/> Other, describe	
A1c. Division, bureau, or office of the CSBG authorized official Alabama Department of Economic and Community Affairs	
A1d. Authorized official of the lead agency : <small>Instructional note: The authorized official could be the director, secretary, commissioner etc. as assigned in the designation letter (attached under item I.3). The authorized official is the person indicated as authorized representative on the SF-424M.</small>	
Kenneth W. Boswell	
A1e. Street address 401 Adams Avenue, Suite 580	
A1f. City Montgomery	A1g. State AL
A1h. Zip 36104	
A1i. Telephone (334) 242-5591	Extension
A1j. Fax (334) 242-5099	A1k. Email kenneth.boswell@adeca.alabama.gov
A1l. Lead agency website www.adeca.alabama.gov	
A.2. Please check additional programs administered by the State CSBG Lead Agency during the reporting year (FFY)	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Weatherization Assistance Program (WAP)	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP)	
<input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Department of Agriculture Programs	
Specify	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Programs	
Specify ESG, CDBG	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other, Describe	
If yes, Please list below:	

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services	OMB Clearance No: 0970-0492
CSBG Annual Report	Expiration Date: 01/31/2020

**Community Services Block Grant (CSBG)
Annual Report - State Administration Module**

**SECTION B
Statewide Goals and Accomplishments**

B.1. Progress on State Plan Goals:
 Describe progress in meeting the State's CSBG-specific goals for State administration of CSBG under this State Plan.

 Goals: The fifth role of ADECA, with respect to community action agencies, is that of partner. ADECA works in partnership with not only the agencies but also with the funding sources, other state agencies, and the Community Action Agencies Association of Alabama (CAAA). The partnerships should serve as a means to provide the widest range possible of services to the low-income in the most cost effective and efficient manner. ADECA will work directly with each agency and its board pertaining to contractual matters or the affairs of that particular agency.

☐ All Goals Accomplished

☒ Goals Partially Accomplished

Describe Progress
 ADECA/CSBG staff worked with the State Association to provide training to the eligible entities. In addition, staff worked with eligible entities in organization standards.

☐ Not Accomplished

Explain

Note: This information is associated with State Accountability Measure 1Sa(i) and will be used in assessing overall progress in meeting State goals.

B.2. CSBG Eligible Entity Overall Satisfaction Targets:
 In the table below, provide the State's most recent target for CSBG Eligible Entity Overall Satisfaction during the performance period (FFY).

Prior Year Target	Most Recent American Customer Survey Index (ACSI) Score	Future Target
0	85	87

Instructional Note:
 Because the CSBG State Plan may cover two fiscal years, annual updates related to CSBG Eligible Entity satisfaction should be provided in this annual report. The State's target score will indicate improvement or maintenance of the State's Overall Satisfaction score from the most recent American Customer Survey Index (ACSI) survey of the State's CSBG Eligible Entities. States that did not receive ACSI scores (i.e. States with only a single CSBG Eligible Entity) should not complete Item B.2, but should provide narrative descriptions of other sources of customer feedback and the State's response to that feedback in question B.3. For more information on the ACSI and establishment of targets, see CSBG Information Memorandum #150 Use of the American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI) to Improve Network Effectiveness.

B.3. CSBG Eligibility Entity Feedback and Involvement:
 How has the State considered feedback from CSBG Eligible Entities, OCS, public hearings, and other sources, and/or customer satisfaction surveys such as the American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI)? What actions have been taken as a result of this feedback?
 The State plans to hold meetings for the State Plan earlier in order to allow agencies to have more input.

B.4. State Management Accomplishment:
 Describe what you consider to be the top management accomplishment achieved by your State CSBG office during the reporting year (FFY). Provide examples of how administrative or leadership actions led to improvements in efficiency, accountability, or quality of services and strategies.
 The CSBG section was moved into the Energy Division of ADECA. The Energy Division also houses the LIHEAP and Weatherization staff and allows closer communication since funding is provided to the most of the same entities.

B.5. CSBG Eligible Entity Management Accomplishments:
 Describe three notable management accomplishments achieved by CSBG Eligible Entities in your state during the reporting year (FFY). Describe how responsible, informed leadership and effective, efficient processes led to high-quality, accessible, and well-managed services and strategies. See Attachment

B.6. Innovative Solutions Highlights:
 Provide at least three examples of ways in which a CSBG Eligible Entity addressed a cause or condition of poverty in the community using an innovative or creative approach. Provide the agency name, local partners involved, outcomes, and specific information on how CSBG funds were used to support implementation. See attachment entered on B5

1. Please identify the cabinet or administrative department of your State CSBG office.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="radio"/> Community Services Department | <input type="radio"/> Governor's Office |
| <input type="radio"/> Human Services Department | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Community Affairs Department |
| <input type="radio"/> Social Services Department | <input type="radio"/> Other (please specify) |

2. What is the division, bureau, or office of the CSBG Administrator?

Energy Division

3. Other programs directed by the CSBG Administrator in FY 2017

a. Does the CSBG Administrator also direct DOE Weatherization?

☐ Yes ☒ No

b. Does the CSBG Administrator also direct part or all of the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) bill payment and/or crisis assistance programs?

☐ Yes ☒ No

1) If yes, does the CSBG Administrator also direct the LIHEAP energy conservation program?

☒ Yes ☐ No

c. Does the CSBG Administrator also direct USDA programs? If yes, please list titles below:

☐ Yes ☒ No

d. Does the CSBG Administrator also direct HUD programs? If yes, please list titles below:

☐ Yes ☒ No

e. Does the CSBG Administrator also direct any other federal programs for the homeless?

☐ Yes ☒ No

f. Does the CSBG Administrator also direct State Head Start programs?

☐ Yes ☒ No

g. How many federal or State programs not listed above are also directed by the CSBG Administrator? (List titles of other programs below)

0

4. Was the State CSBG office subject to a reorganization in FY 2017, such as an expansion or contraction of programs, or a transfer of the CSBG office to a different division or department?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please describe the change (attach an extra page if necessary):

CSBG was moved from the Community and Economic Development Division to the Energy Division

5. State statute regarding CSBG:

a. Does your State have a statute authorizing Community Service programs? (If yes, please attach)

☒ Yes ☐ No

b. Did your State legislature enact authorizing legislation, or amendments to an existing authorizing statute during FY 2017?

☐ Yes ☒ No

Alabama

Section C: General Information on State CSBG Office

Please check those items which describe provisions of the current statute.

1) What is the termination date of the current statute?	<input type="text"/>
2) Does it "grandfather" CAAs?	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
3) Does it specify the terms, or formula, for allotting 90% pass-through funds among eligible entities?	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
4) Does it require local grantees to match CSBG funds?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
5) Does it provide for the designation of new eligible entities?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
6) Does it provide for the de-designation of eligible entities?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
7) Does it specify a process the State CSBG agency must follow to re-designate an existing eligible entity?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
8) Does it designate the bureau, division, or office in State government that is to be the State administering agency?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
9) If it has other provisions, please list them:	
6. a. Did it cost more in FY 2017 than the federally allowed limit in your State's CSBG allocation for your State to effectively administer the range of services and activities required by the CSBG Act?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
b. If yes, what was the amount of these extra costs?	<input type="text"/>
c. If yes, were State funds used to supplement federal administrative expenditures?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
d. If yes, what was the amount of the supplemental State funds?	<input type="text"/>
7. a. How many State positions were funded in whole or in part by CSBG funds?	<input type="text" value="6"/>
b. How many Full Time Equivalents (FTEs) were funded with CSBG funds?	<input type="text" value="3.08"/>
8. a. How many National peer-to-peer ROMA trained staff work in the State Office?	<input type="text" value="0"/>
b. How many Certified Community Action Professionals (CCAPs) work in the State Office?	<input type="text" value="0"/>

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services	OMB Clearance No: 0970-0492			
CSBG Annual Report	Expiration Date: 01/31/2020			
Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) Annual Report - State Administration Module				
SECTION D Organizational Standards for Eligible Entities				
Note: Reference CSBG Information Memorandum #138 State Establishment of Organizational Standards for CSBG Eligible Entities				
D.1. Assessment of Organizational Standards: The CSBG State Plan indicated that the State would use the following organizational standards for its oversight of the CSBG:				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The State will use the CSBG Organizational Standards Center of Excellence (COE) organizational standards (as described in IM 138)				
<input type="checkbox"/> The State will use an alternative set of organizational standards				
D.1a. How did the State assess CSBG Eligible Entities against organizational standards, as described in IM 138?				
<input type="checkbox"/> Peer to Peer review (with validation by the State or State-authorized third party)				
<input type="checkbox"/> Self-assessment (with validation by the State or State-authorized third party)				
<input type="checkbox"/> Self-assessment / Peer review with State risk analysis				
<input type="checkbox"/> State - authorized third party validation				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regular, on-site CSBG monitoring				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other				
On-line Data System allows eligible entities to upload supporting documentation for the standards				
D.1b. Describe the assessment process as implemented by the State. Please describe any changes in the assessment process that occurred since the time of the State plan submission. Please note that with the exception of regular on-site CSBG monitoring, all assessment options above may include either on-site or desk review (or a combination). The specific State approach should be described in the narrative. Each month a desk review for each entity is completed by CSBG staff. Included in the review is the progress of meeting the organizational standards. If progress has not been made since the previous month the entity is notified via email that no progress has been made. Once every 3 years an on-site review is completed for each entity.				
D.2. Organizational Standards Performance: In the table below, please provide the percentage of CSBG Eligible Entities that met all State-adopted organizational standards in the reporting period (FFY). The target set in the CSBG State Plan is provided in the left-hand column. For more information on the CSBG Organizational Standards, see CSBG Information Memorandum # 138.				
Target vs. Actual Performance on the Organizational Standards				
Fiscal Year	State CSBG Plan Target	Number of Entities Assessed	Number that Met <u>All</u> (100%) State Standards	Actual Percentage Meeting <u>All</u> (100%) of State Standards
2017		21	4	19.05%
Progress Indicators <i>Indicate the number of entities that met the following percentages of Organizational Standards</i>				
Note - While the State targets the percent of CSBG Eligible Entities to meet 100% of the Organizational Standards, targets are not set in the State Plan for 90%, 80%, and 70% progress indicators.		Number of Entities Assessed	Number that Met between 90% and 99% of State Standards	Actual Percentage
		21	5	23.81%
		Number of Entities Assessed	Number that Met between 80% and 89% of State Standards	Actual Percentage
		21	6	28.57%
		Number of Entities Assessed	Number that Met between 70% and 79% of State Standards	Actual Percentage
		21	3	14.29%
Note: This information is associated with State Accountability measures 6Sa.				
D.2a. In the space below, please identify the challenges and factors contributing to the difference between the target and actual results provided in the top row of Table D.2. (above) Agencies fail to realize the importance of maintaining documentation to support the standards. Many feel that too much is required for the amount of funding. Some agencies have complained that the information must be presented on an annual basis.				
D.2b. Percentage Meeting Organizational Standards by Category. In the table below, provide the number of eligible entities that met each category of the Organizational Standards. The percentage that met all standards in each category will be automatically calculated and totaled in the bottom row.				

Percentage Meeting Organizational Standards by Category			
Category	Number of Entities Assessed	Number that Met all Standards in Category	Actual Percentage
1. Consumer Input and Involvement	21	18	85.71%
2. Community Engagement	21	16	76.19%
3. Community Assessment	21	13	61.90%
4. Organizational Leadership	21	6	28.57%
5. Board Governance	21	5	23.81%
6. Strategic Planning	21	8	38.10%
7. Human Resource Management	21	10	47.62%
8. Financial Operations & Oversight	21	5	23.81%
9. Data & Analysis	21	8	38.10%

D.3. Technical Assistance Plans and Quality Improvement Plans:
In the table below, please provide the number of CSBG Eligible Entities with unmet organizational standards with Technical Assistance Plans (TAPs) or Quality Improvement Plans (QIPs) in place.

Technical Assistance Plans and Quality Improvement Plans	
Total Number of CSBG Eligible Entities with unmet organizational standards with Technical Assistance Plans (TAPS) in place	0
Total number of CSBG Eligible Entities with unmet organizational standards with Quality Improvement Plans (QIPS) in place	0

D.3.a. If the State identified CSBG Eligible Entities with unmet organizational standards for which it was determined that TAPs or QIPs would not be appropriate, please provide a narrative explanation below.
☒ Yes ☐ No

CSBG staff are providing T&T/A on an individual basis to entities that have unmet standards. Most of these are due to the agencies not providing documentation for compliance.

Note: D.3. is associated with State Accountability Measure 6Sb.

QIPs are described in Section 678C(a)(4) of the CSBG Act.

For additional information on corrective action and the circumstances under which a State may establish TAPs and QIPs, see IM-138, Pages 5-6

Please do NOT use acronyms.
See instructions for further details.

AL

1. Strategic Thinking for Long-Term Solutions

- a. Please describe an agency strategy which addresses a long-term solution to a persistent problem affecting members of the low-income community.

Agency Name: Community Action Agency of Northwest Alabama, Inc.

- i. How did the agency identify the community need?

Homelessness has been a persistent but largely hidden problem in the community. The Community Needs Assessment of 2016 show the community ranks homelessness as no. 7 of the top 10 with Franklin County listing as no. 1. Working with other community service leaders in the Homeless Care Council revealed homeless individuals and families are living in cars, in tents, on couches of friends and other temporary places including shelters.

- ii. How were CSBG funds used to plan, manage, and/or develop the approach?

Agency staff, specifically Family Development Counselors, join the Northwest Alabama Homeless Care Council (HCC), a group of community leaders and concerned citizens from across a 6-county area. The council has worked together for solutions to end homelessness in the Shoals and surrounding areas. One strategy was to write for HUD grants to assist homeless with housing deposits and rent while working toward self-sufficiency. CSBG has enabled these staff to meet and plan.

- iii. What local partners were involved, and how did each contribute to the program?

Local partners are diverse including service agencies such as Community Action, United Way, Salvation Army, National Alliance for Mentally Ill, housing authorities, city representatives, previously homeless persons, community residents, education representatives, bank representatives, faith based partners, lawyers, University of North Alabama and others. Many offered insight into the community, where homeless hang out, experiences with servicing homeless and legal help in setting up the HCC as a 501(c)3.

- iv. What outcome indicators did the agency use to measure success?

4.1 Partnerships among supporters and providers of services to low-income people are achieved.

- v. What outcomes have resulted in FY 2017? If no outcomes yet, when?

The Agency received a HUD grant to help house the homeless written by the Homeless Care Council. This grant would not have been provided to our Agency had it not been for the efforts of all the HCC to combat the problem of homelessness. The grant covers a 6 county area and is used not only to house the homeless but to support them up to 24-months as they work on goals for self-sufficiency and independence.

2. Delivering High-Quality, Accessible, and Well-Managed Services

- a. Please describe what you consider to be the top management accomplishment achieved by your State CSBG office during FY 2017. Show how responsible, informed leadership led to effective and efficient management of the CSBG program.

Top State Management Accomplishment:

Community action data collection and analyzation of same have undergone change and undergo change to more accurately discover and address the greater needs of the low-income communities served by community action agencies. Thanks to the US Department of Health and Human Services Administration for Children and Families, Office of Community Services, a more comprehensive CSBG Performance Framework was introduced early 2017. It was a framework designed to give more focus to continuous improvement and more clearly define goals to yield added, measurable outcomes and drive greater service success and progress in community action. The Alabama Department of Economic and Community Affairs (ADECA) CSBG Office subsequently began administering state training sessions on the Community Services Block Grant Annual Report, the above-referenced tool to be adopted and used at the onset of FY2018. Training has been continuous, in-depth, and all-inclusive to ensure state community action agencies are well-equipped with the know-how to capture outcomes. Alabama's CSBG Office, with its own learning curve to boot, has been readily available, responsive, and helpful through this learning process during FY2017. It is anticipated that this posture of professionalism, coaching, and ready assistance will continue as we all become more familiar with and fully and appropriately utilize the comprehensive ROMA Next Generation framework, ultimately to address the needs of the low-income community. The Standards has made a major impact on how most agencies document activities internally and community management activities, ours included. The state software, FACSPRO, has been a great help for uploading the documents per Standard as required. ADECA is then able to review the documents and provide feedback to help the agency.

- b. Please describe what you consider to be the top three management accomplishments achieved by your agencies during FY 2016. Show how responsible, informed leadership and effective, efficient processes led to high-quality, accessible, and well-managed services.

Top Three Agency Management Accomplishments:

Agency Name: Community Action Agency of Northwest Alabama, Inc.

Accomplishment:

The partnership with Northwest Shoals Community College has allowed us to continue the GED, Work Keys and High School Option, on site at our Florence office. The class was in danger of being cut when the grant was not renewed however the College used other funds to continue the service. Representatives stated this class served a population the College typically had failed to reach, individuals and families with low-incomes.

Agency Name: Jefferson County Committee for Economic Opportunity

Accomplishment:

JCCEO leadership understands the importance of the Agency's delivery of its best programs and services, achievement of greater results in the Jefferson County community, and the importance of improving the Agency's accountability to our customers and the community we serve – all critical to the well-being of the Agency, those we serve, Agency funders, volunteers, partners, and governing entities. It is also understood and communicated agency-wide at JCCEO that, although the Agency achieved 100% compliance with all 58 CSBG Organizational Standards, FY2017, a major management accomplishment, JCCEO management and staff must and will be continually vigilant in complying with and exceeding the well-defined categories and subcategories of Maximum Feasible Participation, Vision and Direction, and Operations and Accountability. Agency-wide accountability maximizes the Agency's potential to best serve, inspires integrity, sparks progress, protects our resources, strengthens the core of the organization, and increases our desired results – all fundamental in fulfilling JCCEO's mission to help the low-income citizens of Jefferson County, Alabama attain financial independence.

Agency Name: Walker County Community Action Agency, Inc.

Accomplishment:

We were able to obtain funding from City of Jasper, Walker County Commissioner, Walker Area Community Foundation, Summer Adventures In Learning, Greater Community Foundation of Birmingham, United Way - Sub-recipient funds from HUD, and private donations.

3. Mobilizing Resources to Support Innovative Solutions

a. Please describe how your agency addressed a cause or condition of poverty in the community using an innovative or creative approach. Showcase how your agency relied on mobilization and coordination of resources to help reach interim and final outcomes. Demonstrate how CSBG "works" as it funds staff activities, investments, or services to meet a community need.

i. Agency Name: Jefferson County Committee for Economic Opportunity

ii. Program Name: Women's Fund of Greater Birmingham Families Forward Program

iii. CSBG Service Category: Education

iv. Description of program (capacity, duration, targeted population, etc)

Jefferson County's high-demand, health-related fields of employment require a work force with education beyond the high school diploma. One's level of education is often directly related to his/her economic status. Higher education and economic security are on the menu for selected low-income JCCEO Child Development Services parents, thanks to a forward-moving, renewed JCCEO/The Women's Fund of Greater Birmingham Families Forward Program Partnership. The primary grant awarded to support this collaboration, from the Women's Fund of Greater Birmingham, provides opportunities for single mothers, whose children are enrolled in the JCCEO Head Start – Early Head Start – Pre-K Program, to learn and soar. Faced with significant barriers to higher education and wages, program participants are given opportunity to minimize these barriers and truly enhance their family's way of living. (According to the 2016 JCCEO Client Survey results, 52.8 percent of respondents either did not graduate from high school or held a high school diploma or GED certification; 96.6 percent were female; 78.2 percent of respondents were heads of household; and 50 percent of them held full-time jobs. (These results correlate with the Agency's '2013' client survey and the most current US Census data and poverty statistics, further substantiating the prevailing education and employment gaps among the low-income.) The program provides tuition, fees, transportation costs, and career coaching to the participating, low-income single mothers. The women attend post-secondary courses in high-demand health fields (Administrative Medical Assisting, Medical Billing and Coding, Clinical Medical Assisting, Phlebotomy Certification Prep, Ophthalmic Vision Care Assisting, Dialysis Technician, or Pharmacy Technician) at Jefferson State Community College (co-collaborator), and upon completion of their program studies, are equipped to perform move on to and encouraged to seek available, living wage jobs.

v. How was the agency's approach innovative or creative? Please be specific.

JCCEO's Child Development Services Division embraces its families as a whole unit, with as much focus on the success and well-being of our Head Start parents as on their children's welfare and their children's future success. Children often model parent behavior and will most likely thrive in and out of classroom, beyond Head Start, Early Head Start, and Pre-K, with parents who are educated beyond high school, have achieved economic stability, and are self-reliant. Gainful employment is within reach for those who have the education and job readiness skills to attain it.

The US Bureau of Labor Statistics has predicted that employment opportunities in healthcare occupations will grow 19% from 2014 to 2024, a much faster average rate of growth than the average growth rate for all occupations. The JCCEO/Women's Fund partnership agreement, targeting Head Start mothers (97% of JCCEO 2016 Client Survey respondents were female; 78% of respondents reported head-of-household status); helping them achieve the educational requirements and skill sets required in high-demand, health-related fields (specifically Administrative Medical Assisting, Medical Billing and Coding, Clinical Medical Assisting, Phlebotomy, Vision

Care/Ophthalmic Tech, Pharmacy Tech, and Dialysis Tech); and improving their chances for future employment in these health-related fields, is very much a creative approach to achieve the mission of JCCEO – that is to help eradicate poverty in Jefferson County and lead our low-income citizens to self-sufficiency via gainful employment.

vi. Outcomes achieved (include the number of people enrolled and areas affected)

Seventeen (17) JCCEO Head Start mothers were enrolled in the Families Forward initiative during the program year. Offered health-related areas of education include Administrative Medical Assisting; Medical Billing and Coding; Clinical Medical Assisting; Phlebotomy; Vision Care/Ophthalmic Tech; Pharmacy Tech; and Dialysis Tech. Outcomes achieved to-date are:

12 – Graduated from the program

6 – Are Employed (three jobs unrelated to health field)

7 – Looking for Employment

4 – Have not taken Certification Exam (two of which are employed)

1 – Did not pass exam

3 – Dropped out of program, one of which is employed

1 – Did not complete program (health issues)

vii. How were CSBG funds used? Please be specific.

CSBG funds were used to help pay salaries for Administrative and Accounting staff who support the Head Start-Early Head Start-Pre-K Program.

viii. What local partners were involved, and how did each contribute to the program?

The circle of partners in this program included The Women's Fund of Greater Birmingham, Jefferson State Community College, and JCCEO.

For the low-income, single mothers of Greater Birmingham who participated in the program, The Women's Fund of Greater Birmingham provided participant tuition, fees, transportation costs, and critical wrap-around services, e.g. career coaching. The women attended post-secondary courses in high-demand health fields at and under the auspices of partnering Jefferson State Community College. Their children and family units, enrolled in the JCCEO Head Start Program, received high-quality, developmentally appropriate, and comprehensive services provided to participants from pregnancy through the year before children go on to kindergarten.

Please do NOT use acronyms.
See instructions for further details.

AL

4. Providing Positive Results for Vulnerable Populations

- a. Please describe one youth-focused initiative that illustrates how CSBG funding was used and coordinated with other programs and resources.

Agency Name: Community Action Agency of Northeast Alabama, Inc.

i. Description of initiative

The agency partnered with the DeKalb County Board of Education to receive a grant to support the effort of promoting career tech education (CTE) and nontraditional students. This grant is called the DeKalb County Core Indicator Program (CIP). Oftentimes, CTE is looked at as a lower education pathway. However, with this program CAANE uses this grant to promote CTE and the many opportunities it provides to high-school students. CTE is education that directly prepares students for high-wage, high-demand careers. CTE covers many different fields from health care to advance manufacturing. CTE encompasses many different types of education from classroom learning to certification programs to work-based learning opportunities outside the classroom. As for nontraditional students, CAANE focused on 6th grade female students and introduced them to an engineering career by attending a Science/Technology, Engineerin/Math (STEM) camp. Nontraditional careers are those occupations in which one gender comprises less than 25% of the current workforce. Women have been known to double their income in occupations traditionally dominated by men. These female students received hands-on instruction on how to build an art robot at the STEM camp.

ii. What local partners were involved, and how did each contribute to the program?

DeKalb County Board of Education provided the grant. CAANE received the grant that provided the advertisement and promotional events of the local DeKalb County Career Technology Center. This grant also provided resources for the STEM camp for the nontraditional students. The instruction was provided by a former female teacher and engineer.

iii. Outcomes achieved (include the number of people enrolled and areas affected)

96 students attended the STEM camp in DeKalb County.

iv. How were CSBG funds used? Please be specific.

The agency used CSBG funds to provide salary support for administrative costs of the grant.

- b. Please describe one senior-focused initiative that illustrates how CSBG funding was used and coordinated with other programs and resources.

Agency Name: Community Action Agency of Northeast Alabama, Inc.

i. Description of initiative

The agency addressed a need that was identified in the community needs assessments that the agency takes each year. One need was evident in each county. This was a nutritional need for the elderly age 55 and older, that are at or below 125% of the Federal Poverty Guideline. The agency continued the CSBG food program that was established in 2015, due to the overwhelming response of gratitude and need. The stories that the intake personnel shared of the simple things such as being able to buy meat and coffee, things we take for granted, are one of the main reasons to continue this program. Oftentimes, the elderly choose between having to pay for utilities and medicine, not leaving much left for groceries. For those who qualify for food stamps, they receive less than \$20.00 per month. The agency took the initiative to help those eligible and issued a gift card of \$50.00 to a local grocery store to purchase food items only.

ii. What local partners were involved, and how did each contribute to the program?

Community Action Agency of Northeast AL, Inc. provided the food gift cards. Community Foundation of Greater Birmingham provided funding for a couponing class and a cooking class to help better utilize their gift card. Alabama Extension Office gave nutritional educational materials.

iii. Outcomes achieved (include the number of people enrolled and areas affected)

1,469 seniors received food gift cards in Blount, Cherokee, DeKalb, Jackson, Marshall, and St. Clair Counties.

iv. How were CSBG funds used? Please be specific.

CSBG provided the salaries for intake staff and the funds to purchase the gift cards.

Number of Agencies Reporting: 21

Table 1: Total amount of CSBG funds expended in FY 2017 by Service Category

Service Category	CSBG Funds
1. Employment	\$1,039,965
2. Education	\$893,217
3. Income Management	\$749,753
4. Housing	\$798,444
5. Emergency Services	\$3,020,651
6. Nutrition	\$840,286
7. Linkages	\$3,441,474
8. Self Sufficiency	\$839,519
9. Health	\$189,701
10. Other	\$0
Totals	\$11,813,010

Of the CSBG funds reported above \$1,528,300 were for administration.

12.94%

Please consult the instructions regarding what constitutes "administration."

Table 2: Of the funding listed in Table 1: Funds for Services by Demographic Category, FY 2017

Demographic Category	CSBG Funds
1. Youth (Aged 12-18)	\$427,152
2. Seniors (Aged 55+)	\$1,599,357

Alabama

Section F: Resources Administered and Generated by the CSBG Network

Number of Agencies Reporting: 21

2. Amount of FY 2017 CSBG allocated to reporting agency:

2. \$12,280,136

Federal Resources (other than CSBG)

3. Weatherization (DOE) (include oil overcharge \$\$)

3. \$1,940,620

4. Health and Human Services (HHS)

a. LIHEAP- Fuel Assistance (include oil overcharge \$\$)

4a. \$40,887,933

b. LIHEAP- Weatherization (include oil overcharge \$\$)

4b. \$794,554

c. Head Start

4c. \$73,051,172

d. Early Head Start

4d. \$10,325,818

e. Older Americans Act

4e. \$36,056

f. Social Services Block Grant (SSBG)

4f. \$0

g. Medicare/Medicaid

4g. \$877,460

h. Assets for Independence (AFI)

4h. \$0

i. Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF)

4i. \$100,000

j. Child Care Development Block Grant (CCDBG)

4j. \$0

k. Other HHS Resources:

i. \$13,800

ii. \$0

iii. \$0

iv. \$0

4k. \$13,800

TOTAL Other HHS Resources:

5. Department of Agriculture (USDA)

a. Special Supplemental Nutrition for Women, Infants, Children (WIC)

5a. \$0

b. All USDA Non-Food Programs (e.g. rural development)

5b. \$0

c. All Other USDA Food Programs

5c. \$9,008,812

6. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)

a. Community Dev. Block Grant (CDBG) - Federal, State, and Local

6a. \$1,239,355

b. Section 8

6b. \$0

c. Section 202

6c. \$0

d. Home Tenant Based Assistance

6d. \$0

e. HOPE for Homeowners Program (H4H)

6e. \$0

f. Emergency Shelter Grant Program (ESGP)

6f. \$173,000

g. Continuum of Care (CofC)

6g. \$378,736

h. All other HUD including homeless programs

6h. \$137,260

7. Department of Labor (DOL)

a. Workforce Investment Act (WIA)

7a. \$133,811

b. Other DOL Employment and training programs

7b. \$293,060

c. All Other US DOL programs

7c. \$0

8. Corp. for National and Community Service (CNCS) programs

8. \$755,523

9. Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)

9. \$346,156

10. Department of Transportation

10. \$133,074

11. Department of Education

11. \$0

12. Department of Justice

12. \$0

13. Department of Treasury

13. \$7,612

14. Other Federal Resources:

i. \$784,703

ii. \$0

iii. \$0

iv. \$0

14. \$784,703

TOTAL Other Federal Resources:

15. TOTAL: NON-CSBG FEDERAL RESOURCES

\$141,418,515

Alabama

Section F: Resources Administered and Generated by the CSBG Network

Number of Agencies Reporting: 21

16. State Resources

a. State appropriated funds used for the same purpose as Federal CSBG funds	a.	\$212,627
b. State Housing and Homeless programs (include housing tax credits)	b.	\$0
c. State Nutrition programs	c.	\$30,000
d. State Day Care and Early Childhood programs	d.	\$6,319,202
e. State Energy programs	e.	\$0
f. State Health programs	f.	\$0
g. State Youth Development programs	g.	\$0
h. State Employment and Training programs	h.	\$0
i. State Head Start programs	i.	\$0
j. State Senior programs	j.	\$273,174
k. State Transportation programs	k.	\$0
l. State Education programs	l.	\$604,038
m. State Community, Rural and Economic Development programs	m.	\$0
n. State Family Development programs	n.	\$79,000
o. Other State Resources		
	i.	\$230,000
	ii.	\$0
	iii.	\$0
	iv.	\$0
Total Other State Resources	o.	\$230,000

17. TOTAL: STATE RESOURCES

\$7,748,041

18. If any of these resources were also reported under Item 15 (Federal Resources), please estimate the amount

\$0

Number of Agencies Reporting: 21

19. Local Resources

a. Amount of unrestricted funds appropriated by local government	19a.	\$459,783
b. Amount of restricted funds appropriated by local government	19b.	\$1,688,020
c. Value of Contract Services	19c.	\$159,215
d. Value of in-kind goods/services received from local government	19d.	\$4,250,000

20. TOTAL: LOCAL PUBLIC RESOURCES

\$6,557,018

21. If any of these resources were also reported under Items 15 or 17,
(Federal or State resources) please estimate the amount

\$0

22. Private Sector Resources

a. Funds from foundations, corps., United Way, other nonprofits	22a.	\$2,315,796
b. Other donated funds	22b.	\$260,212
c. Value of other donated items, food, clothing, furniture, etc.	22c.	\$6,536,782
d. Value of in-kind services received from businesses	22d.	\$5,491,463
e. Payments by clients for services	22e.	\$546,378
f. Payments by private entities for goods or services for low-income clients or communities	22f.	\$246,364

23. TOTAL: PRIVATE SECTOR RESOURCES

\$15,396,994

24. If any of these resources were also reported under Items 15, 17, or
20 (Federal, State, or Local resources) please estimate the amount

\$0

25. TOTAL: ALL Non-CSBG RESOURCES
(FEDERAL, STATE, LOCAL, PRIVATE)
less amount of double count from Items 18, 21, and 24

\$171,120,568

26. TOTAL: (Including CSBG)

\$183,400,704

Alabama

Section G: Program Participant Characteristics

Number of Agencies Reporting: 21

2a. Total Non CSBG resources Reported in Section F TOTAL

\$171,120,568

2b. Total amount of CSBG Funds allocated

\$12,280,136

Total Resources for FY 2017 (2a + 2b)

\$183,400,704

3. Total unduplicated number of persons about whom one or more characteristics were obtained

155,524

4. Total unduplicated number of persons about whom no characteristics were obtained

8,304

5. Total unduplicated number of families about whom one or more characteristics were obtained

82,809

6. Total unduplicated number of families about whom no characteristics were obtained

3,507

7. Gender

NUMBER OF PERSONS*

a. Male

52,286

b. Female

103,128

TOTAL*

155,414

8. Age

NUMBER OF PERSONS*

a. 0-5

16,305

b. 6-11

20,189

c. 12-17

17,995

d. 18-23

8,066

e. 24-44

30,388

f. 45-54

15,216

g. 55-69

29,442

h. 70+

17,923

TOTAL*

155,524

9. Ethnicity/Race

NUMBER OF PERSONS*

I. Ethnicity

a. Hispanic, Latino or Spanish Origin

1,984

b. Not Hispanic, Latino or Spanish Origin

152,392

I. TOTAL*

154,376

II. Race

a. White

42,270

b. Black or African American

109,310

c. American Indian and Alaska Native

526

d. Asian

373

e. Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander

27

f. Other

239

g. Multi-race (any 2 or more of the above)

2,688

II. TOTAL*

155,433

10. Education Levels of Adults #

(# For Adults 24 Years Or Older Only)

NUMBER OF PERSONS*

a. 0-8

377

b. 9-12/Non-Graduates

39,049

c. High School Graduate/GED

39,320

d. 12+ Some Post Secondary

3,569

e. 2 or 4 yr College Graduates

9,241

TOTAL**

91,556

11. Other Characteristics

NUMBER OF PERSONS*

Yes

No

Total

a. Health Insurance

143,450

12,074

155,524

b. Disabled

45,629

109,895

155,524

12. Family Type

NUMBER OF FAMILIES***

a. Single Parent/Female

22,715

b. Single Parent/Male

894

c. Two Parent Household

2,554

d. Single Person

46,445

13. Family Size

a. One

b. Two

c. Three

d. Four

e. Five

f. Six

g. Seven

h. Eight or more

TOTAL***

NUMBER OF FAMILIES***

47,328

15,065

10,126

6,110

2,678

975

320

207

82,809

14. Source of Family Income

NUMBER OF FAMILIES

a. Unduplicated # of Families Reporting One or More Sources of Income***

74,398

b. Unduplicated # of Families Reporting Zero Income***

7,609

TOTAL (a. and b.)***

82,007

c. TANF

1,205

d. SSI

19,351

e. Social Security

39,338

f. Pension

2,360

g. General Assistance

28

h. Unemployment Insurance

738

i. Employment + Other Sources

3,636

j. Employment Only

12,334

k. Other

12,811

l. TOTAL (Items c-k)

91,801

15. Level of Family Income (% of HHS Guideline)

NUMBER OF FAMILIES***

a. Up to 50%

19,620

b. 51% to 75%

22,243

c. 76% to 100%

19,593

d. 101% to 125%

13,581

e. 126% to 150%

6,600

f. 151% to 175%

951

g. 176% to 200%

114

h. 201% and over

107

TOTAL***

82,809

16. Housing

NUMBER OF FAMILIES***

a. Own

33,081

b. Rent

49,011

c. Homeless

199

d. Other

314

TOTAL***

82,605

e. Two Adults/No children

5,431

f. Other

4,764

TOTAL***

82,803

Alabama

Outcomes of Efforts, FY 2017 - NPI 1.1

Number of Agencies Reporting: 17

Goal 1: Low-income people become more self sufficient.

Employment

The number and percentage of low-income participants who get a job or become self-employed, as a result of Community Action Assistance, as measured by one or more of the following:

	I.) Number of Participants Enrolled in Program(s) (#)	II.) Number of Participants Expected to Achieve Outcome in Reporting Period (Target) (#)	III.) Number of Participants Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (Actual) (#)	IV.) Percentage Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period [III/II=IV] (%)
A. Unemployed and obtained a job	21	3,140	3,093 ind.	99.71%
B. Employed and maintained a job for at least 90 days	21	587	544 ind.	152.81%
C. Employed and obtained an increase in employment income and/or benefits	21	378	335 ind.	103.08%
D. Achieve "living wage" employment and/or benefits	21	564	521 ind.	168.06%

National Performance Indicator 1.1

NASCSP CSBG IS FY 2017

Printed On: 5/11/2018

Number of Agencies Reporting: 21

Goal 1: Low-income people become more self sufficient.

Employment Supports

The number of low-income participants for whom barriers to initial or continuous employment are reduced or eliminated through assistance from Community Action, as measured by one or more of the following:

	I.) Number of Participants Enrolled in Programs (#)			II.) Number of Participants Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (#)		
A. Obtained skills/competencies required for employment	21	1,930	ind.	1,888	ind.	
B. Completed ABE/GED and received certificate or diploma	21	80	ind.	27	ind.	
C. Completed post-secondary education program and obtained certificate or diploma	21	100	ind.	54	ind.	
D. Enrolled children in before or after school programs	21	492	ind.	450	ind.	
E. Obtained care for child or other dependant	21	4,473	ind.	4,431	ind.	
F. Obtained access to reliable transportation and/or driver's license	21	89	ind.	52	ind.	
G. Obtained health care services for themselves and/or family member	21	4,809	ind.	4,767	ind.	
H. Obtained and/or maintained safe and affordable housing	21	790	ind.	755	ind.	
I. Obtained food assistance	21	1,709	ind.	1,668	ind.	
J. Obtained non-emergency LIHEAP energy assistance	21	27,823	ind.	27,750	ind.	
K. Obtained non-emergency WX energy assistance	21	1,980	ind.	66	ind.	
L. Obtained other non-emergency energy assistance (State/local/private energy programs. Do not include LIHEAP or WX)	21	297	ind.	259	ind.	

Alabama

Outcomes of Efforts, FY 2017 - NPI 1.3

Number of Agencies Reporting: 15

Goal 1: Low-income people become more self sufficient.

Economic Asset Enhancement and Utilization

The number and percentage of low-income households that achieve an increase in financial assets and/or financial skills as a result of Community Action assistance, and the aggregated amount of those assets and resources for all participants achieving the outcome, as measured by one or more of the following:

Enhancement A. Number and percent of participants in tax preparation programs who qualified for any type of Federal or State tax credit and the expected aggregated dollar amount of credits

Enhancement B. Number and percent of participants who obtained court-ordered child support payments and the expected annual aggregated dollar amount of payments

Enhancement C. Number and percent of participants who were enrolled in telephone lifeline and/or energy discounts with the assistance of the agency and the expected aggregated dollar amount of savings

I.) Number of Participants Enrolled in Programs (#)	II.) Number of Participants Expected to Achieve Outcome in Reporting Period (Target) (#)	III.) Number of Participants Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (Actual) (#)	IV.) Percentage Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period [(III)/II=IV] (%)	V.) Aggregated Dollar Amounts (Payments, Credits, or Savings) (\$)
5	830	988	ind.	\$602,130
21	139	76	ind.	\$168,570
21	2,203	1,520	144.93%	\$12,761

National Performance Indicator 1.3

NASCSP CSBG IS FY 2017

Printed On: 5/11/2018

Alabama

Outcomes of Efforts, FY 2017 - NPI 1.3

Number of Agencies Reporting: 21

Goal 1: Low-income people become more self sufficient.

Economic Asset Enhancement and Utilization

Utilization D. Number and percent of participants demonstrating ability to complete and maintain a budget for over 90 days

Utilization E. Number and percent of participants opening an Individual Development Account (IDA) or other savings account

Utilization F. Number and percent of participants who increased their savings through IDA or other savings accounts and the aggregated amount of savings

Utilization G. Number and percent of participants capitalizing a small business with accumulated IDA or other savings

Utilization H. Number and percent of participants pursuing post-secondary education with accumulated IDA or other savings

Utilization I. Number and percent of participants purchasing a home with accumulated IDA or other savings

Utilization J. Number and percent of participants purchasing other assets with accumulated IDA or other savings

I.) Number of Participants Enrolled in Programs (#)	II.) Number of Participants Expected to Achieve Outcome in Reporting Period (Target) (#)	III.) Number of Participants Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (Actual) (#)	IV.) Percentage Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period [III/II=IV] (%)	V.) Aggregated Dollar Amounts (Payments, Credits, or Savings) (\$)
467	821	460 ind.	56.03%	
0	0	0 ind.	#Num!	
2	0	1 ind.	#Div/0!	\$0
0	0	0 ind.	#Num!	\$0
0	0	0 ind.	#Num!	\$0
16	0	15 ind.	#Div/0!	\$5,600
0	0	0 ind.	#Num!	\$0

National Performance Indicator 1.3

NASCSP CSBG IS FY 2017

Printed On: 5/11/2018

Number of Agencies Reporting: 11

Goal 2: The conditions in which low-income people live are improved.

Community Improvement and Revitalization

Increase in, or safeguarding of, threatened opportunities and community resources or services for low-income people in the community as a result of Community Action projects/initiatives or advocacy with other public and private agencies, as measured by one or more of the following:

	I.) Number of Projects or Initiatives (#)		II.) Number of Opportunities and/or Community Resources Preserved or Increased (#)
A. Jobs created, or saved, from reduction or elimination in the community	21	4	527
B. Accessible "living wage" jobs created, or saved, from reduction or elimination in the community	21	5	530
C. Safe and affordable housing units created in the community	21	2	179
D. Safe and affordable housing units in the community preserved or improved through construction, weatherization or rehabilitation achieved by Community Action activity or advocacy	21	11	109
E. Accessible safe and affordable health care services/facilities for low-income people created, or saved from reduction or elimination	21	1	58
F. Accessible safe and affordable child care or child development placement opportunities for low-income families created, or saved from reduction or elimination	21	3	809
G. Accessible before-school and after-school program placement opportunities for low-income families created, or saved from reduction or elimination	21	4	430
H. Accessible new or expanded transportation resources, or those that are saved from reduction or elimination, that are available to low-income people, including public or private transportation	21	0	0
I. Accessible or increased educational and training placement opportunities, or those that are saved from reduction or elimination, that are available for low-income people in the community, including vocational, literacy, and life skill training, ABE/GED, and post secondary education	21	13	432

Number of Agencies Reporting: 4

Goal 2: The conditions in which low-income people live are improved.

Community Quality of Life and Assets

The quality of life and assets in low-income neighborhoods are improved by Community Action initiative or advocacy, as measured by one or more of the following:

	I.) Number of Program Initiatives or Advocacy Efforts (#)	II.) Number of Community Assets, Services, or Facilities Preserved or Increased (#)
A. Increases in community assets as a result of a change in law, regulation or policy, which results in improvements in quality of life and assets	21 0	0
B. Increase in the availability or preservation of community facilities	21 4	53
C. Increase in the availability or preservation of community services to improve public health and safety	21 1	1
D. Increase in the availability or preservation of commercial services within low-income neighborhoods	21 0	0
E. Increase in or preservation of neighborhood quality-of-life resources	21 2	462

Number of Agencies Reporting: 21

Goal 2: The conditions in which low-income people live are improved.

Community Engagement

The number of community members working with Community Action to improve conditions in the community.

I.) Total Contribution by Community (#)

A. Number of community members mobilized by Community Action that participate in community revitalization and anti-poverty initiatives

21 13,920 individuals

B. Number of volunteer hours donated to the agency
(This will be ALL volunteer hours)

21 690,785 hours

Number of Agencies Reporting: 21

Goal 3: Low-income people own a stake in their community.

Community Enhancement through Maximum Feasible Participation

The number of volunteer hours donated to Community Action	I.) Total Number of Volunteer
A. Total number of volunteer hours donated by low-income individuals to Community Action (This is ONLY the number of volunteer hours from individuals who are low-income)	21 399,059 hours

(Thus, out of 690,785 total volunteer hours reported in 2.3B, 399,059 hours were from low-income participants.)

Number of Agencies Reporting: 16

Goal 3: Low-income people own a stake in their community.

Community Enhancement through Maximum Feasible Participation

The number of low-income people mobilized as a direct result of Community Action initiatives to engage in activities that support and promote their own well-being and that of their community, as measured by one or more of the following:

I.) Number of Low-Income People (#)

A. Number of low-income people participating in formal community organizations, government, boards or councils that provide input to decision-making and policy-setting through Community Action efforts	21	723	individuals
B. Number of low-income people acquiring businesses in their community as a result of Community Action assistance	21	0	individuals
C. Number of low-income people purchasing their own home in their community as a result of Community Action assistance	21	39	individuals
D. Number of low-income people engaged in non-governance community activities or groups created or supported by Community Action	21	1,843	individuals

Alabama

Outcomes of Efforts, FY 2017 - NPI 4.1

Number of Agencies Reporting: 21

Goal 4: Partnerships among supporters and providers of services to low-income people are achieved

Expanding Opportunities through Community-Wide Partnerships

The number of organizations, both public and private, that Community Action actively works with to expand resources and opportunities in order to achieve family and community outcomes.

I.) Unduplicated Number of Organizations (#)

II.) Number of Partnerships (#)

A. Non-Profit	21	724	organizations	1,042	partnerships
B. Faith Based	21	434	organizations	502	partnerships
C. Local Government	21	357	organizations	452	partnerships
D. State Government	21	215	organizations	349	partnerships
E. Federal Government	21	73	organizations	123	partnerships
F. For-Profit Business or Corporation	21	445	organizations	619	partnerships
G. Consortiums/Collaboration	21	53	organizations	81	partnerships
H. Housing Consortiums/Collaboration	21	90	organizations	135	partnerships
I. School Districts	21	151	organizations	242	partnerships
J. Institutions of postsecondary education/training	21	113	organizations	174	partnerships
K. Financial/Banking Institutions	21	43	organizations	78	partnerships
L. Health Service Institutions	21	269	organizations	335	partnerships
M. State wide associations or collaborations	21	32	organizations	44	partnerships
N. Total number of organizations and total number of partnerships CAAs work with to promote family and community outcomes (automatically calculates)		2,999	organizations	4,176	partnerships

Alabama

Outcomes of Efforts, FY 2017 - NPI 5.1

Number of Agencies Reporting: 21

Goal 5: Agencies increase their capacity to achieve results

Agency Development

The number of human capital resources available to Community Action that increase agency capacity to achieve family and community outcomes, as measured by one or more of the following:

I.) Resources in Agency (#)

A. Number of Certified Community Action Professionals	21	2	individuals
B. Number of Nationally Certified ROMA Trainers	21	22	individuals
C. Number of Family Development Certified Staff	21	37	individuals
D. Number of Child Development Certified Staff	21	75	individuals
E. Number of Staff attending trainings	21	2,934	individuals
F. Number of Board Members attending trainings	21	263	individuals
G. Hours of staff in trainings	21	89,467	hours
H. Hours of Board Members in trainings	21	1,835	hours

Number of Agencies Reporting: 21

Goal 6: Low-income people, especially vulnerable populations, achieve their potential by strengthening family and other supportive environments.

Independent Living

The number of vulnerable individuals receiving services from Community Action who maintain an independent living situation as a result of those services:

I.) Number of Vulnerable Individuals Living Independently (#)

A. Senior Citizens (seniors can be reported twice, once under Senior Citizens and again if they are disabled under Individuals with Disabilities, ages 55-over)

21	47,369	individuals
----	--------	-------------

B. Individuals with Disabilities

Ages:

0-17

21	1,334	individuals
----	-------	-------------

18-54

21	13,962	individuals
----	--------	-------------

55-over

21	30,333	individuals
----	--------	-------------

Age Unknown

18	0	individuals
----	---	-------------

TOTAL individuals with disabilities

45,629	individuals
--------	-------------

Alabama

Outcomes of Efforts, FY 2017 - NPI 6.2

Number of Agencies Reporting: 21

Goal 6: Low-income people, especially vulnerable populations, achieve their potential by strengthening family and other supportive environments.

Emergency Assistance

The number of low-income individuals served by Community Action who sought emergency assistance and the number of those individuals for whom assistance was provided, including such services as:

		I.) Number of Individuals Seeking Assistance (#)		II.) Number of Individuals Receiving Assistance (#)	
A. Emergency Food	21	3,180	individuals	3,180	individuals
B. Emergency fuel or utility payments funded by LIHEAP or other public and private funding sources	21	22,712	individuals	22,651	individuals
C. Emergency Rent or Mortgage Assistance	21	1,278	individuals	1,245	individuals
D. Emergency Car or Home Repair (i.e. structural, appliance, heating system, etc.)	21	46	individuals	45	individuals
E. Emergency Temporary Shelter	21	41	individuals	41	individuals
F. Emergency Medical Care	21	83	individuals	83	individuals
G. Emergency Protection from Violence	21	26	individuals	26	individuals
H. Emergency Legal Assistance	21	6	individuals	6	individuals
I. Emergency Transportation	21	166	individuals	166	individuals
J. Emergency Disaster Relief	21	2	individuals	2	individuals
K. Emergency Clothing	21	871	individuals	871	individuals

Number of Agencies Reporting: 16

Goal 6: Low-income people, especially vulnerable populations, achieve their potential by strengthening family and other supportive environments.

Child and Family Development

The number and percentage of all infants, children, youth, parents, and other adults participating in developmental or enrichment programs who achieve program goals, as measured by one or more of the following:

The number and percentage of all infants, children, youth, parents, and other adults participating in developmental or enrichment programs who achieve program goals, as measured by one or more of the following:	I.) Number of Participants Enrolled in Program(s) (#)	II.) Number of Participants Expected to Achieve Outcome in Reporting Period (Target) (#)	III.) Number of Participants Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (Actual) (#)	IV.) Percentage Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period [III/II=IV] (%)
Infant and Child A. Infants and children obtain age appropriate immunizations, medical, and dental care.	2111,746	10,990	11,746 ind.	106.88%
Infant and Child B. Infant and child health and physical development are improved as a result of adequate nutrition	2111,415	11,561	11,415 ind.	98.74%
Infant and Child C. Children participate in pre-school activities to develop school readiness skills	2111,913	10,476	11,913 ind.	113.72%
Infant and Child D. Children who participate in pre-school activities are developmentally ready to enter Kindergarten or 1st Grade	216,047	6,855	6,047 ind.	88.21%
Youth E. Youth improve health and physical development	215,604	5,633	5,604 ind.	99.49%
Youth F. Youth improve social/emotional development	212,375	2,847	2,367 ind.	83.14%
Youth G. Youth avoid risk-taking behavior for a defined period of time	212,648	2,973	2,648 ind.	89.07%
Youth H. Youth have reduced involvement with criminal justice system	213,207	3,537	3,207 ind.	90.67%
Youth I. Youth increase academic, athletic, or social skills for school success	212,382	2,740	2,374 ind.	86.64%
Adult J. Parents and other adults learn and exhibit improved parenting skills	217,500	5,436	7,498 ind.	137.93%
Adult K. Parents and other adults learn and exhibit improved family functioning skills	218,023	5,893	8,009 ind.	135.91%

Alabama

Outcomes of Efforts, FY 2017 - NPI 6.4

Number of Agencies Reporting: 21

Goal 6: Low-income people, especially vulnerable populations, achieve their potential by strengthening family and other supportive environments.

Family Supports (Seniors, Disabled, and Caregivers)

Low-income people who are unable to work, especially seniors, adults with disabilities, and caregivers, for whom barriers to family stability are reduced or eliminated, as measured by one or more of the following:

	I.) Number of Participants Enrolled in Program(s) (#)		II.) Number of Participants Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (#)
A. Enrolled children in before or after school programs	21	6	6 individuals
B. Obtained care for child or other dependant	21	147	147 individuals
C. Obtained access to reliable transportation and/or driver's license	21	38	38 individuals
D. Obtained health care services for themselves or family member	21	1,025	915 individuals
E. Obtained and/or maintained safe and affordable housing	21	490	477 individuals
F. Obtained food assistance	21	8,803	8,798 individuals
G. Obtained non-emergency LIHEAP energy assistance	21	47,340	47,242 individuals
H. Obtained non-emergency WX energy assistance	21	1,078	302 individuals
I. Obtained other non-emergency energy assistance (State/local/private energy programs. Do not include LIHEAP or	21	406	405 individuals

Alabama

Outcomes of Efforts, FY 2017 - NPI 6.5

Number of Agencies Reporting: 21

Goal 6: Low-income people, especially vulnerable populations, achieve their potential by strengthening family and other supportive environments.

Service Counts

The number of services provided to low-income individuals and/or families, as measured by one or more of the following:

I.) Number of Services (#)

A. Food Boxes	21	800,227	boxes
B. Pounds of Food	21	836,732	pounds
C. Units of Clothing	21	23,371	units
D. Rides Provided	21	44,340	rides
E. Information and Referral Calls	20	88,690	calls